

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXVII, No. 16

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1934

WHOLE No. 733

AN ERROR CORRECTED

The reference required for note 2a to Professor Korfmacher's article, Three Phases of Classical Type Characterization (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27, 85, 88 A, top), is as follows: Bliss Perry, A Study of Prose Fiction², 116 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920).

CHARLES KNAPP

LONGINUS AND LATER LITERARY CRITICISM¹

I

If scholars are right, some time within the current decade we might well be commemorating the nineteen hundredth anniversary of the writing of the famous Greek treatise 'On the Sublime'^{1a}. Admired, quoted, and paralleled by romanticist and classicist alike, during the four centuries since its *editio princeps* was published, translated into twelve languages, this treatise comes to its nineteenth centenary as fresh and as youthful and as impressive as it was when "Terentianus", to whom it is addressed, first read it. The author of this treatise is himself, as Pope said², "that great Sublime he draws", and the treatise is a true classic of criticism. At least it meets its own requirements, as set forth in 7.3-4^{3a}:

... For that is really great which bears a repeated examination, and which it is difficult or rather impossible to withstand, and the memory of which is strong and hard to efface. 4. In general, consider those examples of sublimity to be fine and genuine which please all and always. For when men of different pursuits, lives, ambitions, ages, languages, hold identical views on one and the same subject, then that verdict which results, so to speak, from a concert of discordant elements makes our faith in the object of admiration strong and unassailable.

The men of different pursuits, lives, ambitions, ages, languages who have admired this treatise range in time from Mr. R. A. Scott-James, author of The Making of

Literature...., a very recent book on the history of literary criticism³, back to the nameless scribe who, in the tenth century, made the Paris manuscript of the treatise, and recorded his admiration of three passages in it by entering in the margin either the symbol which meant 'N. B.' or that which meant 'Beautiful'. Isaac Casaubon, the great Huguenot scholar, treasured and annotated his copy of the first edition of the essay, and called it 'a book of gold'. Boileau, translating the essay into French in 1674, wrote a eulogy of it in his Preface, saying, besides other things, "... Et, en parlant du sublime, il est lui-même très-sublime". This sentence was, undoubtedly, the original of the last verse in Pope's tribute, in the Essay on Criticism (3.116-121), to Longinus:

Thee, bold Longinus! all the Nine inspire,
And bless their Critic with a Poet's fire.
An ardent Judge, who zealous in his trust,
With warmth gives sentence, yet is always just;
Whose own example strengthens all his laws;
And is himself that great Sublime he draws.

Pope's great predecessor, Dryden⁴, had spoken of "Longinus, who was undoubtedly, after Aristotle, the greatest critic among the Greeks". Fénelon had ranked Longinus's work above Aristotle's Rhetoric. In Germany, Wernicke was extolling him. Bishop Hurd, whose Letters on Chivalry and Romance mark him as one of the early Romanticists, wrote thus to Warburton⁵: "In a word, LONGINUS was the person, whom, of all the critics of antiquity, nature seems to have formed with the proper talents to give the last honour to his profession, and penetrate the very soul of fine writing".

In the nineteenth century Longinus's name does not appear so frequently. But the critics and the historians of criticism and literature join in praising him. To Egger⁶, Longinus's treatise is "un des plus précieux monuments des lettres grecques à leur décadence", and is "si populaire parmi les hommes de goût"⁷. Saintsbury⁸, in his History of Criticism, wrote:

Amidst all this desert and chaos of wasted industry there stands the great rock of the *Περὶ Ὑψους*, with its shade and refreshment in the weary land of its own contemporaries, and with its brow catching the dawn which was not to shine fully for more than fifteen hundred years, and is hardly noonday yet....^{9a}

¹Rolfe Arnold Scott-James, The Making of Literature: Some Principles of Criticism Examined in the Light of Ancient and Modern Theory (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1929).

^{1a}In The Author's Apology for Heroic Poetry and Poetic Licence, Prefaced to The State of Innocence (1677). See W. P. Ker, Essays of John Dryden, 1.179 (Two volumes. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1900).

²In his Dedication of his edition of the Epistola ad Augustum (= Horace, Epistulae 2.1 [1751]).

³See M. E. Egger, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Critique chez les Grecs, 293 (Paris, 1850).

⁴Egger, 289 (see note 6, above).

⁵See George Saintsbury, A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe from the Earliest Times to the Present Day, 1.179 (Three volumes. Edinburgh and London, W. Blackwood and Sons, 1900-1904).

^{9a}How can a dawn ever be noonday? See note 2a, above. C. K. >

<¹With this paper throughout should be compared Professor John Paul Pritchard's article, Aristotle's Poetics and Certain American Literary Critics, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27, 81-85, 89-93, 97-99, and his review of Marvin Theodore Herrick, The Poetics of Aristotle in England, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27, 61-62. Some pertinent passages will be found also in the article by Professor S. E. Bassett, The Inductions of the Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Aeneid, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27, 105-110, 113-118. C. K. >

^{1a}The translation of the treatise 'On the Sublime' which I use throughout this paper is the translation by W. Rhys Roberts, published in the volume entitled Longinus on the Sublime: The Greek Text, Edited After the Paris Manuscript, With Introduction, Translation, Fascimiles and Appendices¹ (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1907). I am indebted to this book and to articles by its author for most of the information I present in regard to the authorship of the treatise under discussion, dates, manuscripts, editions, and translations.

²Essay on Criticism 3.121.

^{3a}The quotations are, Professor Nitchie assures me, in every instance exact. Those from Longinus I have myself verified, all of them. Critics, it seems to me, ought to be themselves above criticism or even suspicion in the matter of expression and punctuation. However, in the quotations Professor Nitchie gives from modern critics of style there is much, alike in language and in punctuation, especially the latter, to distress a careful editor's soul. *Quis custodiet custodes ipsos?* applies here, decidedly. C. K. >

The diapason closes with Mr. Churton Collins⁹ and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch¹⁰, with Mr. Scott-James¹¹, who says that Longinus's "light burns not less brilliantly for all the centuries that have passed, and it may burn more brilliantly still in the future", and with a contemporary American poet who, meeting me casually one day, burst forth, "Have you read Longinus? Say, he's great!"

II

Who is this Longinus, praised so highly and so long? Unhappily, no one knows. Until the early part of the last century, it was taken for granted that he was the third-century rhetorician, Cassius Longinus, who was chief counsellor of Zenobia. But the fact that the manuscripts bore various ascriptions—'Dionysius Longinus', 'Dionysius, or Longinus' (both occur in the Paris manuscript), and 'Anonymous'—gave scholars pause. Internal evidence points pretty clearly to the early part of the first century as the time of composition, but there is no evidence of any kind to establish the identity of the writer. Guesses made concerning his identity include Plutarch and the various known bearers of the name Dionysius, but they are only guesses. He is, as Professor Baldwin calls him¹², 'The Great Unknown....' A few individuals still believe him to be the historical Longinus, but most scholars are agreed that he is not. Yet it is convenient to use the name by which he has gone for so many centuries.

There are eleven (possibly twelve) manuscripts of the treatise *Περί Ὑψους*. The best of these is Codex Parisinus 2036, of the tenth century. Even this is incomplete. The missing folia amount, probably, to about one-third of the original work (fifteen folia, perhaps, out of forty-five, more or less). The losses are, to be sure, deplorable, especially those at the end, where the author seems to promise a discussion of the passions. Yet the thirty folia that have survived follow one another with little serious incoherence, and contain much of value in themselves, both in critical principles and judgments and in illustrative passages.

The first printed edition of the treatise was that by F. Robortello, published at Basle, in 1554. Many other editions followed. The treatise has been translated into Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, English, German, Dutch, Swedish, Polish, Russian, and Modern Greek.

Although the title of the treatise is commonly translated by 'On the Sublime', the work is really a discussion of good style, of excellence in writing¹³. Its

author says (1.3) that "sublimity is a certain distinction and excellence in expression...." Good style, he holds, is the basis of the eminence and renown of great writers. He goes on to say (1.4):

... The effect of elevated language upon an audience is not persuasion but transport.... Our persuasions we can usually control, but the influences of the sublime bring power and irresistible might to bear, and reign supreme over every hearer.... Sublimity flashing forth at the right moment scatters everything before it like a thunderbolt....

Longinus next discusses the question of the dependence of sublimity upon art, points out the two main faults, bombast and frigidity, that keep an author from attaining sublimity, and then sets forth his test of sublimity (7.2-3):

... For, as if instinctively, our soul is uplifted by the true sublime; it takes a proud flight, and is filled with joy and vaunting, as though it had itself produced what it has heard. 3. When, therefore, a thing is heard repeatedly by a man of intelligence, who is well versed in literature, and its effect is not to dispose the soul to high thoughts, and it does not leave in the mind more

"Burke's *Sublime and Beautiful* has no manner of connexion with the *De Sublimitate*...." Burke says that "terror is in all cases whatsoever either more openly or latently the ruling principle of the sublime", and Kant postulates a similar basis for the 'dynamically sublime'. Kames does constantly quote and paraphrase Longinus, but he limits the 'sublime' to the 'greatly elevated'. Schiller's treatment is almost wholly philosophical. Several of the literary critics, such as Boileau and De Quincey, pointed out the real meaning of *ὑψος*, as Longinus himself defined it. But, although the writers on aesthetics show little of Longinus's influence, the popularity of the treatise in the neo-classic period certainly gave currency to the words *sublime*, *bathos*, *bombast*, *frigidity*, and to the pairing of the sublime and the pathetic, the sublime and the ridiculous, which are used well into the nineteenth century and by unexpected writers. Burns heard them up in Scotland, perhaps among the literary folk of Edinburgh, and wrote "To make a happy fire-side clime To weans and wife, That's the true pathos and sublime Of human life".

The writings referred to above in this note are as follows: Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of the Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, Part 2, § 2 (Dublin, 1766); Henry Home, Lord Kames, *Elements of Criticism*, Revised and Edited by Rev. J. J. Boyd (New York, Barnes, 1871: the work was originally published in 1762); Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Aesthetic Judgement*, Translated by James Creed Meredith (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1911); Frederick Schiller, *Essays Aesthetical and Philosophical*, Translated from the German (London, Bell, 1910).

<It seems to me well worth while to quote what Professor Roberts (see note 1a, above), 23-24, wrote on the meaning of the title of the treatise:

"The contents and character of the treatise will be found to be admirably indicated in the traditional Greek title *Περί Ὑψους* and in its accepted English equivalent *On the Sublime*, if only the words *ὑψος* and *sublime* be correctly understood.

The English equivalent has, no doubt, often caused misconception. The treatise has been thought to be at once more ambitious in purpose, and more narrow in scope, than it really is. But the Greek title *Περί Ὑψους*, 'Concerning Height or Elevation', does not convey that idea of abnormal altitude which is often associated with the word *sublime*. The object of the author rather is to indicate broadly the essentials of a noble and impressive style. In fact, if we were to describe the treatise as one on style, or even on literary criticism generally, we should be nearer the mark than if we connected it solely with the idea of 'sublimity' in the narrower sense. The author's own words make this plain, for early in his book (1.3) he remarks that the friend whom he is addressing is too well versed in literary studies to need the reminder that sublimity is a certain distinction and excellence in expression, and that it is from no other source than this that the greatest authors have derived their eminence and gained an immortality of renown...."

It is worth while to quote also what Professor Charles Sears Baldwin says (on page 123 of the work named in note 12, above):

"... The Greek word *<ὑψος>* is more general <than our word *sublime*>. Meaning literally height, it includes in this treatise all such effects of style as lift us, as move us beyond comprehension or assent to sympathy or resolve. But though the meaning is clear, an equivalent English term is still to seek. *Elevation* has unfortunate suggestions of the rhetorical; *height* is too vague; *heightening*, though nearer, is not generally used in this sense. Falling back on such a periphrasis as *heightening of style*, we become aware that our word *style*, as used generally and untechnically, is not far from the author's intention. Though in text-books and works of criticism it is often extended, in ordinary parlance it means that very heightening, or lift, which is discussed by the Great Unknown. So we shall convey his intention as fairly as seems feasible by translating his title *Style*". C. K.>.

⁹John Churton Collins, *Longinus and Greek Criticism*, in his *Studies in Poetry and Criticism* (London, Bell, 1905).

¹⁰See A. T. Quiller-Couch, *A Note on Longinus*, in his *Studies in Literature*, Third Series (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1930).

¹¹See page 94 of the work referred to in note 3, above.

¹²See Charles Sears Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*, 123 (New York, Macmillan, 1924). <For a review, by Professor G. C. Fiske, of this book, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19, 62-63. C. K.>

¹³The statements so often made about the influence of Longinus upon aesthetic theory are evidently based upon a wrong interpretation of the Greek title of the treatise. Bernhard Bosanquet, in *A History of Aesthetic*, 106 (London, Sonnenschein, New York, Macmillan, 1910), says, "However philosophically incomplete, this work... is probably responsible for the exceedingly important part played by the theory of the Sublime in modern speculation". Yet of those who wrote of the Sublime or of 'das Erhabene' (Burke, Kames, Kant, Schiller) only Kames seems to have written with Longinus in mind. Bosanquet declares that Burke followed Longinus, but Professor Roberts says, far more correctly (260), that

food for reflexion than the words seem to convey, but falls, if examined carefully through and through, into disesteem, it cannot rank as true sublimity because it does not survive a first hearing....

There follows the passage quoted at the beginning of this paper on the permanence and the universality of the appeal of the truly great.

There are five principal sources of the sublime, Longinus continues, all resting upon the common foundation of the "gift of discourse, which is indispensable...." (8.1). The first two, grandeur of conception, and vehement and inspired passion, are innate in the writer; the other three, the due formation of figures, noble diction, and dignified composition (the assembling of words into harmonious and effective combinations), are the result of art.

The remainder of the essay is given over mainly to the development of these points, with the exception of the second, which Longinus reserves for treatment in another place. The discussion of this point may have formed the end of the treatise, which is now lost. There is a brief discussion of the qualities of style which interfere with the attainment of the sublime. In the last chapter (44), the author, answering a query as to the causes of the lack of good writing in his own day, blames the love of money and the love of pleasure. In the midst of his discussion of diction, there is a very important digression (33-36) on the superiority of the writer who is sublime but faulty over him who is faultless but mediocre.

This brief summary indicates how many perennially interesting questions are broached and dealt with by Longinus. But no summary can give the *quality* of the essay.

First among the characteristics of the treatise that strike the reader is the vigorous common sense of the author, who is at once rhetorician and poet. Judicially he avoids extremes, sees both sides of a controversial question, and realizes that it is often possible to strike a balance between them that is nearer what is right than either of them can be. This is the reason why he may be quoted as an authority by all schools of criticism. If one wishes to prove, with Dennis¹⁴, that religious poetry is the very acme of sublimity, he may (conveniently forgetting Longinus's citation of Sappho's love poem) point out that Longinus used passages about the gods for his illustrations of the sublime. If one wishes to make out a case for the neo-classic 'rules' or the neo-classic doctrine of imitation, he may quote Longinus; if he wishes to show that the genius who forsakes the rules may be justified and may be greater than he who observes them, he may quote Longinus. If one wishes to prove that literature has as its aim not teaching or conviction, but pleasure, he may point to Longinus's insistence upon the power of the sublime to 'transport'; if he wishes to prove that literature has a direct connection with morals, he may remind his reader that "...Sublimity is the echo of a great soul...." (Longinus 9.2), and that Longinus had asserted (44.6-9) that the dearth of good writing in his day was

due to the love of money and the love of pleasure. Consistency, we may recall, is the hobgoblin of *little* minds. Moreover, the reconciliation of these apparently opposing ideas is only a matter of applying common sense. The great is great, whatever the school in accordance with whose theories it was written. Flaubert wrote¹⁵, in one of his letters, 'When a verse is good, it loses its school. A good verse by Boileau resembles a good verse by Hugo'.

With the keen point of his good sense, his level judgment, and his wit Longinus pricks the bubble of the extremist and the pretender, in criticism and in creative writing. In another passage (22.1) he says, "art is perfect when it seems to be nature, and nature hits the mark when she contains art hidden within her....", but, he drily maintains, also (2.3), "...Most important of all, we must remember that the very fact that there are some elements of expression which are in the hands of nature alone, can be learnt from no other source than art...." Elsewhere (5.1) he throws his lance in another direction: "All these ugly and parasitical growths arise in literature from a single cause, that pursuit of novelty in the expression of ideas which may be regarded as the fashionable craze of the day...." A third target is the man who in his imagery copies a copier of life (15.8):

...For example, the clever orators forsooth of our day, like the tragedians, see Furies, and—fine fellows that they are—cannot even understand that Orestes when he cries

Unhand me!—of mine Haunting Fiends thou art—
Dost grip my waist to hurl me into hell!

has these fancies because he is mad....

In his critical method, too, as well as in his ideas, Longinus can lend aid and comfort to both sides: there are laws for good writing, he says, and we must judge in accordance with them, but the real test of sublimity is its power to 'transport' the individual reader. Therefore he makes a careful and specific analysis of the passages which he chooses as examples of the sublime, and gives reasons for his judgments on those passages. On the other hand, he commends Caecilius, another writer on the sublime, for (1.2) "his happy thought and his enthusiasm...." He himself deserves that commendation; his enthusiastic love of good literature is evident in his every statement.

Critics of modern times (e. g. Hobbes, Cowley, Rymer, Saint-Évremond, Chateaubriand, and their successors) have, consciously or unconsciously, followed Longinus in the use of the comparative method in criticism. Longinus sets over against each other writers who are good but different in their goodness, such as Cicero and Demosthenes; he puts side by side sublimity and mediocrity, as in Plato and Lysias, Demosthenes and Hyperides, Homer and Aristeas or Aratus; he compares different passages on the same theme, such as the various descriptions of the gods in Homer and in the opening verses of Genesis; or he sets an author against himself, an Iliad against an Odyssey.

¹⁴See The Letter to Madame X, in The Complete Works of Gustave Flaubert, 10.50 (Ten volumes. New York and London, Walker Dunne, 1904). The letter is undated, but belongs, probably, to 1853.

¹⁵John Dennis, The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry (1704).

For penetrating criticism of this kind wide reading and a catholic taste are necessary. Longinus is the only ancient Greek critic who shows any acquaintance with other languages. Most of his examples, naturally, come from Greek literature. His essay is a veritable anthology of Greek literature. In the thirty extant folia more than forty Greek poets and prose writers are cited, ranging in time from Homer's day to Longinus's. He mentions also several writers not named elsewhere. Some of the passages cited by Longinus are preserved nowhere else^{15a}. A notable example is Sappho's beautiful ode to Anactoria, which, except for Longinus (10.2), we should know only in Catullus's imitation of it (51). Longinus knows Cicero also. Most striking of all is his reference to Hebrew literature. He paraphrases (9.8) the opening of the book of Genesis, comparing it with those passages in which Homer represents "the divine nature as it really is—pure and great and undefiled . . ." This passage from Genesis was a bone of contention among the French critics of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and has been regarded by some scholars as an interpolation¹⁶. But it fits perfectly into Longinus's argument, and internal evidence seems to attest its genuineness. Longinus, who frequently trusted his memory, has not quoted the passage in Genesis exactly. His version (9.9) is even more dramatic than the original in Genesis:

... Similarly, the legislator of the Jews, no ordinary man, having formed and expressed a worthy conception of the might of the Godhead, writes at the very beginning of his Laws, 'God said'—What? 'Let there be light, and there was light; let there be land, and there was land.' . . .

Many passages in the essay justify Pope's claim¹⁷ that the Muses had blessed their critic with a poet's fire, and Boileau's statement¹⁸ that in writing about style Longinus had employed all the *finesses* of style. As an example at once of his use of figurative language and of his critical acumen we may cite his famous comparison of Cicero and Demosthenes (12.4):

... Our orator <Demosthenes>, owing to the fact that in his vehemence,—aye, and in his speed, power and intensity,—he can as it were consume by fire and carry away all before him, may be compared to a thunderbolt or flash of lightning. Cicero, on the other hand, it seems to me, after the manner of a widespread conflagration, rolls on with all-devouring flames, having within him an ample and abiding store of fire, distributed now at this point now at that, and fed by an unceasing succession . . .

Indeed the whole essay is studded with gems of thought and expression: "... For the judgment of style is the last and crowning fruit of long experience . . ." (6); "... Sublimity is the echo of a great soul . . ." (9.2); "... By what means has the orator here concealed the figure? Clearly, by the very excess of light . . ." (17.2); "... beautiful words are in very truth the peculiar light of thought . . ." (30.1); "... Homer seems

to me . . . to have made, as far as lay within his power, gods of the men concerned in the Siege of Troy, and men of the gods . . ." (9.7); "... For (as I never cease to say) the deeds and passions which verge on transport are a sufficient lenitive and remedy for every audacity of speech . . ." (38.5). See especially 35.2-3:

... Nature has appointed us men to be no base or ignoble animals; but when she ushers us into life and into the vast universe as into some great assembly, to be as it were spectators of the mighty whole and the keenest aspirants for honour, forthwith she implants in our souls the unconquerable love of whatever is elevated and more divine than we. 3. Wherefore not even the entire universe suffices for the thought and contemplation within the reach of the human mind, but our imaginations often pass beyond the bounds of space, and if we survey our life on every side and see how much more it everywhere abounds in what is striking, and great, and beautiful, we shall soon discern the purpose of our birth . . .

In very truth this sublimity is the echo of a great soul. This is good doctrine for our lax and hasty, materialistic and acquisitive age.

III

The influence of Longinus upon critical theory and practice in France and in England during the neo-classic period, as well as the favor in which he was held, are not to be doubted. His influence has been traced by other writers^{19a}. I wish here only to bring out certain important points, to present some that have been neglected, and to challenge some statements in regard to the neo-classic period and also the period that followed it.

Italy, the birthplace of Humanism, the land in which the manuscript of the *Περὶ Ὑψους* was discovered, and the home of the first few editions and translations of the treatise, would naturally first feel Longinus's influence. In spite of the resemblance of Dante's ideas about diction to those of Longinus, it is probable that he had not read the Greek treatise: Robortello, the first editor of Longinus, says that the treatise was unknown before his edition appeared. Strangely enough, the name of Longinus appears little in the criticism which followed, although Minturno¹⁹ may have owed to him the idea of the third function of poetry: "It will be the business of the poet so to speak in his verses that he may teach, that he may delight, that he may *move*". It is to the criticism of France and England, and in a lesser degree, to that of Germany, that we must go for massed evidence of Longinus's influence.

So far as any definite signs indicate, England knew Longinus first in 1636, through Langbaine's Latin translation of his work. I should like to think that George Puttenham knew him. In *The Arte of English Poesie*, published in 1589, he tells us that the effect of figures of speech is to "inveigle and appassionate the

^{15a}These facts would not, per se, make Longinus's work of real critical importance. Aulus Gellius cites many authors, both Greek and Latin, more, in fact, than Longinus cites. It is what Longinus says about various authors that makes his work more important than e. g. Gellius's. C. K. >

¹⁶Compare Roberts, 231-237 (see note 1a, above).

¹⁷Essay on Criticism 3.117.

¹⁸See the Preface to *Traité du Sublime, ou du Merveilleux dans le Discours*, Traduit du Grec de Longin (1674).

^{19a}See e. g. Roberts, 257-261 (see note 1a, above); John Churton Collins, *Longinus and Greek Criticism*, in *Studies in Poetry and Criticism* (London, Bell, 1905); Sir A. T. Quiller-Couch, *A Note on Longinus*, in *Studies in Literature*, Third Series (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1930); J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 1.xcix, 3.300 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1909).

¹⁹See Minturno, *De Poeta* 2.102 (Venice, 1559), as translated in George Saintsbury, *Locci Critici*, 86 (Boston, Ginn, 1903). See Saintsbury's note (86, note 3).

mind", to "transport the reader", and that, therefore, judges forbid their use in oratory, but regard them as permissible in poetry. Longinus said (17.1-2):

... The cunning use of figures is peculiarly subject to suspicion, and produces an impression of ambush, plot, fallacy... a figure is at its best when the very fact that it is a figure escapes attention. 2. Accordingly, sublimity and passion <which belong peculiarly to poetry, of course> form an antidote and a wonderful help against the mistrust which attends upon the use of figures....

Elsewhere Puttenham makes a distinction between the images used by the orators and those used by the poets, for "the design of the poetical image is enthrallment, of the rhetorical vivid description". Furthermore, he gives us "Sixe Points Set Downe by our Learned Forefathers for a Generall Regiment of all Good Utterance", two of which, "Ciriologia", "sound, proper, and naturall speech", and "Tropus", "lively and stirring" expression, are words used almost exclusively by Longinus. In another place Puttenham uses "Epi-monie", a word traced to Longinus and the Rhetoric of Alexander, although employed by them both in a sense different from that in which Puttenham uses the word²⁰.

That Ben Jonson also knew Longinus would be easy to believe, but difficult to prove. Although a few passages in Jonson's *Timber* and in a preface to one or two of his other works remind us of the Greek treatise, Jonson does not mention it or Longinus's name. But Jonson was a scholar. By the time of the latest date assignable to *Timber* there had been three editions and two Latin translations of the *Περί Ύψους*. Langbaine brought out his Latin version at Oxford in 1636. Some talk of it may well have been in the air for several years before that date. Moreover, Isaac Casaubon, the great Huguenot scholar, was much at the court of James at the time that Jonson was writing masques for the royal entertainments. Casaubon deemed the Greek treatise, of which he owned a first edition, 'a book of gold', and, though we have no record of it, may well at the court have discussed its contents. Although, as Mark Pattison²¹ tells us, "the wits of the Mermaid were jealous of the foreign pensioner", one of those wits may not have failed to listen and remember if word were handed round about a book in many respects after his own heart. There were, therefore, several ways in which Jonson *might* have come in contact with Longinus's views. If he did, it still is strange that he nowhere used Longinus's name. But he was not given to injecting new elements into the classical critical tradition; nor did he always jot down the author of his 'discovery'. It is conceivable that, though he heard and remembered the ideas, the actual source was, for him, lost in oblivion.

All this time, Aristotle and Horace were the two authorities actually quoted by the critics. The name of Longinus is nowhere mentioned in this period. But in 1644, in his treatise *Of Education*, Milton speaks of "a graceful and ornate Rhetorick, taught out of the rule of Plato, Aristotle, Phalaris, Cicero, Hermogenes,

Longinus". After the appearance of Boileau's French version in 1674 with its introduction and, later, its appended 'Reflexions', Longinus was, as Le Clerc said²², in everybody's hands, both in France and in England.

In France a violent dispute arose, a phase of the Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns, in which Boileau, Le Clerc, Perrault, and Huet took part, over the question whether Longinus was warranted in ranking the passage from Genesis as sublime. Because of the simplicity of the language in the passage, some critics thought Longinus's judgment of it wrong. Dryden, beginning with the Apology for Heroic Poetry and Poetic Licence (prefixed, in 1677, to The State of Innocence, but possibly written in the very year of Boileau's translation), quotes, misquotes, echoes, borrows, and steals from Longinus with amazing zeal and enthusiasm. Sir A. T. Quiller-Couch²³ says that "no one who reads Dryden's Prefaces in comparison with the *Περί Ύψους* can doubt for a moment... that he had his Longinus fairly by heart". His inaccuracies show that he did not always have it by his head, but had read it with characteristically hasty enthusiasm. Dryden's turn of phrase, moreover, often demonstrates that he had read not Longinus's treatise, but Boileau's *Traité du Sublime ou du Merveilleux dans le Discours*. But there is not the slightest doubt of Dryden's enthusiasm for Longinus or of the influence of Longinus on him, even though Longinus was filtered to him through Boileau.

Nor is there any doubt about the rest of the French and English critics for the next seventy-five years. A few dissenting voices there were. Voltaire opposed some of Longinus's opinions, although he shared others; Dr. Blair quarreled with Longinus's conception of sublimity, drawing a warm defense of Longinus from Dr. Stack, of the Royal Irish Academy²⁴. But such heretics were rare. The list of true believers is most interestingly headed by John Dennis. As were Dryden and Pope, he was a strong admirer of Longinus. Mr. H. G. Paul says of him²⁵:

... To his age Dennis stood as the champion of emotion as the basis of poetry, as an advocate of the exaltation and inspiration of the poet that so ill accorded with the spirit of the times that he was derisively dubbed 'Sir Longinus.' Of this Greek writer Dennis was a student; and his ideas regarding the sublime are in part echoes from *On the Sublime*, viewed, however, through the commentaries of Boileau.

Dennis's combination of neo-classic ideas and Longinian theory is sometimes amusing. In *The Grounds of Criticism*²⁶ he insists upon the power of poetry to move and the necessity that it move and excite passion. But its aim, he says, is finally to instruct. The strongest "Enthusiastic Passions" are necessarily raised by religious ideas. This he sets out to prove by reason (he

²⁰See J. Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana*, 85 (London, 1700), quoted by J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 3-300 (see note 18a, above).

²¹Studies in Literature, 149 (Cambridge: At the Clarendon Press, 1930).

²²See Monthly Review 81 (1789), 42-46, in an Account of the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy for 1787.

²³H. G. Paul, John Dennis, His Life and Criticism, 134 (Columbia University Press, 1911).

²⁴For this work see note 14, above.

²⁵Longinus's words are *κυριολογία, τρόποι, and ἐπιμονή* (see Roberts, pages 202, 208, 199 of the work named in note 1a, above).

²⁶Isaac Casaubon, 429 (London, Longmans, 1875).

emphasizes the Longinian 'greatness of soul'), by authority, and by examples. His authorities are Aristotle, Hermogenes, and Longinus, and the greatest of these is Longinus. All the examples of sublimity that Longinus gave in Chapter 9, Dennis argues, were "taken from the Grecian Religion". To be sure, he says, Longinus does not tell us directly that the greatest sublimity is to be derived from religious ideas. Evidently, Dennis continues, Longinus did not have a perfectly clear idea of sublimity, for in one place he even said that it could exist without passion, which contradicts his doctrine of 'transport'. He had, however, the right idea of the sublime. His failure to express it clearly may have been due to his failure to recognize clearly that religion is its chief source. But this is really the basis of what Longinus says in Chapter 7. So writes Dennis, rationalist and advocate—though a fairly liberal one—of the Rules, as he tries to reconcile his enthusiasm for Longinus with his neoclassicism.

The list of Longinus's supporters is a roster of the great and the near-great of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, classic and romantic alike: Milton, Dryden, Pope, Dennis, Addison, Swift, Akenside, Goldsmith, Young, Welsted, Hurd, Joseph Warton (who pretended to have discovered a work of Biblical criticism by Longinus), Reynolds, Fielding, Burke, Gibbon, Fox. The magazines, e. g. The Quarterly Review and The Monthly Review, are full of references, scholarly and casual, to Longinus. As a matter of course, his name was placed with Aristotle's and Horace's, sometimes with Aristotle's alone. Of the critics who use rules Hurd says³⁷, "The most eminent, at least the most popular, are, perhaps, Longinus, of the Greeks; P. Bouhours, of the French; and Mr. Addison, with us in England". James Ralph wrote in The Touchstone, in 1726:

... There <at the Universities> they grow familiar with the Title pages of ancient and modern Authors, and will talk of Aristotle, Longinus, Horace, Scaliger, Bossu, Dacier, as freely as if born acquaintance: Their mouths are filled with the Fable, the Moral, Catastrophe, Unity, Probability, true Sublime, Bombast, Simplicity, Magnificence, and all the critical Jargon which is learned in a quarter of an Hour, and answers to talk of one's whole life after.

That all such talk, superficial as it might be, could not be without influence upon the critical writing of the period is obvious. Bishop Hurd³⁸, admirer though he is of Longinus, laments the extremes to which the practitioners of the Longinian method have gone: "Accordingly in the last and present century, ... a numberless tribe of commentators have attempted, after the manner of Longinus, to flourish on the excellencies of their composition". Some have succeeded so well, he continues, that this is regarded as the only "just Criticism". But in ordinary hands it has degenerated "into the most unmeaning, frivolous, and disgusting jargon, that ever discredited polite letters" (this dictum has its echo in the current War of the Critics). That such misuse is not necessary, however, Bishop Hurd proved to his own satisfaction by saying that Warburton, to

whom he was writing, had united the merits of Aristotle and Longinus.

(To be Concluded)

GOUCHER COLLEGE,
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

ELIZABETH NITCHIE

AN ALLEGED MIRACLE

In his monograph, *The Cults of Campania* (Papers and Monographs of The American Academy in Rome, Volume I, printed, in Italy, for the Academy, in 1919), Mr. Roy Merle Peterson reports (293) the following occurrence from Nuceria: "... The top of an elm tree had been cut off and laid upon an altar in the *temenos*, when suddenly it gave signs of life, a token—as was proved by the result—of a revival in the fortunes of the Roman people..." <the italics in the words "laid upon the altar" are mine>. The passage quoted in support (Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 16.132), however, reads: in *luco* Iunonis ulmo, postquam etiam cacumen amputatum erat, *quoniam in aram ipsam procumbebat*, restituta sponte ita ut protinus floreret.... It is clear that the top was *not* cut off and laid on the altar, but that the top was lopped off because the tree grew in such a way as to interfere with the use of the altar¹, and that, in spite of this operation, the tree trunk immediately put forth new shoots on which flowers appeared. It is even possible that *floreret* merely means 'flourished', and that Pliny did not think of actual blossoms at all; compare also Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, 2.605, and Walter F. Otto, *Philologus* 64 (1905), 173. Thus the miracle disappears in a natural occurrence.

Mr. Peterson puts the *temenos* mentioned in the words quoted above from him in a temple of Juno: at the beginning of the paragraph from which the quotation given above is taken he says, "Juno is known to have had a temple outside the walls <of Nuceria> surrounded by a sacred grove...." But Pliny does not speak of a temple; he speaks merely of a sacred grove in which an altar of the goddess stood. On page 295, Mr. Peterson, still wrongly thinking of a temple of Juno, says, "The temple has been located between the towns of Nocera and Pagani at a place called *Campodara* (Arae Campus?), where remains were found, but this identification is extremely dubious". Since Mr. Peterson's sole ancient authority throughout this discussion is Pliny, N. H. 16.132, in which, as was pointed out above, not a word is said about a temple, Mr. Peterson may rightly say "this identification is extremely dubious".

HUNTER COLLEGE

ERNST RIESS

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

VIII

Mercure de France—October 15, Pour Nos Traditions Nationales: La Prononciation du Latin, A. Barthélemy; December 1, Archéologie, G. Contenau [this

¹<One who interprets the passage thus—rightly. I am sure—ought to omit the comma after *amputatum erat*. C. K.>.

³⁷In the work mentioned in note 5, above.

- contains a review, generally favorable, of M. Exsteens, *Préhistoire*; *Lettres Antiques*, Mario Meunier [this contains reviews, favorable, of J. Bidez, *Oeuvres Complètes de l'Empereur Julien*, Volume I, Part I (*Discours de Julien César*), and P.-E. Legrand, *Hérodote: Histoires*, Volume I (*Introduction*)].
- The Musical Quarterly—October, *Music in the World's Proverbs*, Clement A. Harris.
- The National Geographic Magazine—October, *Exploring the Secrets of Persepolis*, Charles Breasted ["...this ancient capital of Darius and Xerxes is now being excavated by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Not only have amazing works of ancient art been found, but Dr. Ernst E. Herzfeld, Field Director of the Expedition, exploring for the Oriental Institute, has also uncovered a body of archives of the Persian kings, containing some 20,000 clay tablets inscribed in cuneiform characters". The article is accompanied by forty-eight photographic illustrations, one map, and one Plan].
- The National Review—October, Brief review, generally favorable, anonymous, of Dorothy M. Stuart, *The Girl Through the Ages* ["A record of the infancy, childhood and girlhood of women in civilised countries from the Egyptian Dynasties down to the present day"].
- The New Republic—October 18, Brief review, very favorable, anonymous, of Arthur K. Rogers, *The Socratic Problem*; November 1, Review, generally favorable, by J. V. Mauzey, of Paul Shorey, *What Plato Said*.
- New York Public Library, Bulletin of the—November, *An Exhibition of Illuminated Manuscripts in the Spencer Collection*, Philip Hofer [the article is accompanied by four full-page illustrations].
- Nuova Antologia (Rome)—September 16, *Umanità di Giulio Cesare*, Emilio Bodrero; *Memorie Inedite di un Archeologo*, V. Felice Barnabei; *Filologica Classica*, Augusto Rostagni [this contains reviews of recent Italian verse translations of Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Tibullus, Pindar's *Olympian Odes*, and Euripides's *Cyclops*]; October 1, *Grecia e Roma nel Giudizio e negli Ideali dell' Età Augustea*, Augusto Rostagni.
- The Quarterly Review—October, Brief review, generally favorable, anonymous, of Edith Hamilton, *The Roman Way*; Brief review, favorable, anonymous, of W. J. Woodhouse, *King Agis of Sparta and His Campaign in Arkadia in 418 B. C.*
- La Revue de Paris—October 1, *Les Nefs Médiévales contre les Galères Antiques au Siège de Constantinople en 1453: Contribution à l'Histoire du Gouvernement*, Commandant Lefebvre des Noëttes [the first section makes a survey of the history of the ship and the rudder from the origins to the nineteenth century]; November 1, *L'Histoire*, A. Albert-Petit [this contains a review, uncritical, of Pierre Jouguet, Victor Chapot, and C. Diehl, *Histoire de la Nation Egyptienne*, Volume III, and of Arthur Weigall, *Marc Antoine* (Translated into French by Maurice Gérin)].
- Revue des Deux Mondes—November 1, *Quarante Ans de Guerre aux Études Classiques <en France>*, L. Blum.
- The Saturday Review of Literature—September 30, Review, generally favorable, by Henry S. Canby, of Naomi Mitchison, *The Delicate Fire* [short stories about the ancient world]; October 7, Review, favorable, by H. W. Boynton, of Anne C. E. Allinson, *Selected Essays* [some of which are on classical themes]; October 21, Brief review, favorable, by <Carl P. > R <ollins>, of Helen Gentry and David Greenwood, *Chronology of Books and Printing*, 300 B. C. to 1932; November 11, Review, very favorable, by E. C. Streeter, of Logan Clendening, *Behind the Doctor* ["a vivid, episodic account of the main achievements of man in the field of medicine from prehistoric times to the present"]; December 9, Review, unfavorable, by Howard M. Jones, of Burton Rascoe, *Prometheans: Ancient and Modern*; Review, generally favorable, by C. W. M., of William C. Greene, *The Achievement of Rome*; December 23, Brief review, mildly favorable, by E. D., of Mason Hammond, *The Augustan Principate*.
- School and Society—October 7, Review, favorable, by William McAndrew, of Guglielmo Ferrero, *The Life of Caesar*; November 25, *Ancient History and Turkish Schools*, Walter W. Hyde [a brief note]; December 2, Review, uncritical, by William McAndrew, of Henry D. Sedgwick, *The Art of Happiness* ["a popular summary of the doctrine of pleasure as preached by Epicurus"].
- The School Review—November, Review, generally favorable, by Alice N. Gibbons, of Hutton Webster, *Early European Civilization*.
- "Scientia"—October, *L'Étude des Légendes dans la Méthodologie de l'Histoire Ancienne*, Jean Bayet; December, Brief review, favorable, by Louis Halphen, of M. Croiset, *La Civilisation de la Grèce Antique*; Review, uncritical, by Enrico de Michelis, of H. Brocher, *Le Mythe du Héros et la Mentalité Primitive*.
- Sewanee Review—January-March, *Orpheus and Eurydice*, Valery Brusov [a poem, translated from the Russian by Eugene M. Kayden]; *Antigone*, Lodwick Hartley [a poem].
- The Times Literary Supplement (London)—September 14, Review, generally favorable, of W. A. Laidlaw, *History of Delos*; Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of Charles H. Sherrill, *Mosaics in Italy, Palestine, Syria, Turkey and Greece*; Brief review, unfavorable, of Edith Hamilton, *The Roman Way*; September 21, Brief review, favorable, of Jotham Johnson, *Excavations at Minturnae*, Volume II: *Inscriptions*, Part I: *Republican Magistri*, With an Appendix of *Classical References to the Site*; Brief review, generally favorable, of R. P. Hinks, *Catalogue of the Greek Etruscan and Roman Paintings and Mosaics in the British Museum*; September 28, Review, favorable, of Martin P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*; Keats and the *Argonautica*, J. Livingston Lowes ["It is hard to resist the conclusion that Keats had read, recalled and woven into his own

fabric <of the Endymion> reminiscences of <W.> Preston's 'Argonautica' <a translation of the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes>"; Brief review, favorable, of Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Volume II: The Lloyd Collection; October 5, Review, favorable, of Percy Gardner, *Autobiographica*; Review, favorable, of Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion*; Review, generally favorable, of C. R. Haines (translator), *The Carmina of Quintus Horatius Flaccus*; Review, very favorable, of C. M. Bowra, *Ancient Greek Literature*; Brief review, unfavorable, of Arthur S. Barnes, *The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul*; Brief review, generally favorable, of F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Eusebius Pamphili, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine and First Christian Historian*; Brief review, favorable, of A. W. Gomme, *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.*; Brief review, favorable, of Alexander Bessmertny, *Das Atlantis-Rätsel*; October 12, Review, generally favorable, of J. Leslie Mitchell, *Spartacus* [an historical novel]; Review, generally favorable, of C. E. Stevens, *Sidonius Apollinaris and His Age*; Brief review, uncritical, of Marbury B. Ogle and Dorothy M. Schulian, *Rodulfi Tortarii Carmina* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Volume VIII); October 19, Brief review, generally favorable, of Mabel Gude, *A History of Olynthus*; Brief review, favorable, of E. H. Blakeney, *The Copa and the Moretum: Two Poems Attributed to Virgil*, Edited with Notes.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

J. W. SPAETH, JR.

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

IX

The American Historical Review—July, Review, favorable, by Allen B. West, of William Scott Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age*; Review, very favorable, by Grace H. Macurdy, of M. Cary, *The Legacy of Alexander: A History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B. C.*; Review, favorable, by Walter Woodburn Hyde, of Claudii Ptolemaei *Geographiae Codex Urbinae Graecus 82*, Phototypice Depictus, Consilio et Opera Curatorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae, <Edited by> Joseph Fischer; Review, mildly unfavorable, by Casper J. Kraemer, Jr., of Geoffrey Neale Cross, *Epirus: A Study in Greek Constitutional Development*; October, Review, favorable, by Allen B. West, of *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Volume IX; Review, favorable, by Robert Samuel Rogers, of M. Rostovtzeff, *Caravan Cities: Petra, Jerash, Palmyra, Dura*; Review, favorable, by Ivan M. Linforth, of Louis Gernet and André Boulanger, *Le Génie Grec dans la Religion*; Short review, mildly favorable, by Harold N. Fowler, of Bessie Ellen Richardson, *Old Age*

among the Ancient Greeks: *The Greek Portrayal of Old Age in Literature, Art, and Inscriptions, With a Study of the Duration of Life among the Ancient Greeks on the Basis of Inscriptional Evidence*; Short review, qualifiedly favorable, by Richard Haywood, of Mario Attilio Levi, *Ottaviano Capoparte: Storia Politica di Roma durante le Ultime Lotte di Supremazia*.

The American Journal of Sociology—September, Short review, favorable, by T. V. Smith, of Jean Ithurriague, *Les Idées de Platon sur la Condition de la Femme au Regard des Traditions Antiques*.

American Literature—November, Poe Notes: "Pinakidia" and "Some Ancient Greek Authors", David K. Jackson.

The American Mercury—September, Harry Thurston Peck, Walter Guest Kellogg ["...as Professor Peck, its bearer was known from coast to coast, not as the Anthon Professor of the Latin Language at Columbia University, but as a literary pundit whose pronouncements reached and influenced a vast number of people". *The American Mercury* of January, 1934, contains a communication from Milton Halsey Thomas correcting this article regarding the date of Professor Peck's death]; December, *Marching Into the Morning*, Edgar Lee Masters [this is a poem, of eighty-seven verses, dealing with the function of Clio, the muse of history].

Anglican Theological Review—October, *The Classics in the New Testament*, F. W. Gingrich ["...The classicist might well acquaint himself with the best in liberal New Testament scholarship, and the student of the New Testament, in turn, might well be careful to avail himself of all that classical Greek can contribute to his field, even at the sacrifice of a course or two in the social sciences!"]; Review, favorable, by F. H. Hallock, of E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Alexander Book in Ethiopia*; Review, favorable, by Henry B. Washburn, of Paul Monceaux, *St. Jerome: The Early Years*; Book note, favorable, unsigned, on Frederic G. Kenyon, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*; Book note, favorable, unsigned, on *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, New Edition, Revised by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie, Part 7.

Asia—September-October, *Spades are Trumps at Persepolis*, Charles Breasted [with eight photographic illustrations].

Bibliotheca Sacra—July, *The First Twelve Roman Emperors*, II, E. G. Sihler [in this second installment the author deals with Caligula, Claudius, and Nero]; November, *The Twelve First <sic> Roman Emperors*, III: Conclusion, E. G. Sihler [in this third and final installment, with its different title, the author deals with Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian].

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

ADOLPH F. PAULI